

## **LAKESIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEETING – July 2010**

DATE: 7/27/2010 TIME: 7:00pm

PLACE: Lakeside Sewer District Meeting Room; 253 Bierney Creek Rd.

NOTICED: County P&Z website Calendar of Events page; Lakeside Plan Committee's website Calendar Page, posters in Library and Post Office in Lakeside; submitted to Daily Inter Lake Daybook column.

### **AGENDA:**

1. Call to order
2. Sign-in sheet
3. Approve Agenda
4. Approve prior meeting minutes –
  - a. Approve meeting minutes from June 29
5. Review/recommendations on any County applications in the Lakeside planning area (if any are scheduled)
  - a. None to consider
6. Guest presentations or reports (listed below, if any are scheduled)
  - a. None
7. Sub-committee reports from any LCC authorized subcommittees (listed below, if any are scheduled)
  - a. None scheduled
8. Procedural discussions or items (listed below, if any are scheduled)
  - a. Review proposed changes to By-Laws.
9. Public Comment.
10. Meeting adjourned

### **MINUTES:**

#### **Attendance:**

- Council Members Attending: Gene Shellerud, Mike Wilson, Rex Boller, Keith Brown, Barb Miller, David Fetveit (QUORUM)
- Council Members not in Attendance: Brent Hall
- P&Z Staff Attending: none
- Public: Jasmine Linabarry (WSN)

1. Meeting called to order at 7:04pm.
2. Sign-in sheet passed.
3. Added to agenda: update on the Blacktail Trail project; update on the Lakeside Plan; update on issue of pump-out station at the marina at The Docks.
4. David motioned, Gene seconded, and passed unanimously to approve meeting minutes for June 29, 2010.
5. No County business to consider.
6. No Guest presentations scheduled.
7. Sub-committee reports
  - a. Blacktail Trail proposal
    - i. After proposal submitted, Jeff Harris formed an evaluation committee to evaluate the 3 proposals that had been submitted (Blacktail Trail in Lakeside, Swan River Trail, Historic Red Bridge Trail in Columbia Falls). The evaluation is attached to these minutes.

- ii. The Blacktail and Swan River trails scored the highest and the committee's recommendation was to allocate \$400,000 each to Blacktail and Swan River and none to Red Bridge.
- iii. The report was sent to the Commissioners and it was discussed in their July 8 meeting (Brennerman & Dupont present; Lauman absent)
- iv. Bottom line, the Commissioners were not ready to allocate any funds until they had more time to review. Commissioners are the only ones who can allocate funding for projects such as these. Dupont pointed out that Columbia Falls was protesting the results. Jeff pointed out that there was a flaw in the process in that the news media article that asked for proposals did not specify the criteria against which proposals would be evaluated and therefore proposals were missing information (LCC's proposal was missing info on on-going maintenance and length of time for completion of project. Commissioners agreed to talk amongst themselves and come to a decision.
- v. A follow up discussion by the Commissioners, open to the public, is scheduled for 9:30am, Wednesday, August 4, in the Commissioners' meeting room. LCC members are encouraged to attend. Barb will contact YWAM to request their attendance to address building, funding, and maintenance issues which they have previously indicated they could help with.

b. Lakeside Plan:

- i. Response at the Annual Lakeside Fair was very good – an additional 78 signatures were obtained on the petition to the County Planning Board and Commissioners to adopt the revised Lakeside Plan. Care was taken to ask people if they lived in the planning area before they signed. Note that some of the signers were new residents or property owners in the area. Many took a copy of the 4-page summary printed for hand-outs.
- ii. The public hearing by the Planning Board is scheduled for 6pm, Wednesday, September 15. The Planning Board has stated they want significant support for the plan to be demonstrated. The LCC needs to make a concerted effort to get as many people at the meeting or writing letters/emails to PB & Commissioners indicating their support for the revised Plan.
- iii. Suggestion was made and supported to use the remaining 4-page summaries printed and ask Homeowners' Associations to send them out with their newsletters or regular communications to their residents & property owners. Barb will look into this.

c. Pump out station at the Marina:

- i. Keith spoke with Trevor. The station has been stubbed in. He is awaiting approval, but is unsure how to go about getting it and who needs to approve it.
- ii. Barb motioned, David seconded, and passed unanimously that Keith would write a letter to both Trevor and P&Z indicating LCC support of the pump station asking for information on what is needed to proceed.

- 8. Reviewed proposed changes to the By-Laws. David motioned, Gene seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the By-Laws as revised. Barb to send the revision to the County for review by attorney's office and approval of commissioners.
- 9. No public comments were made.
- 10. Keith motioned, Barb seconded and passed unanimously to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 7:35pm.

## CETP Funding for the Blacktail Trail project – Evaluation Results



### Flathead County

#### Planning & Zoning


1035 1<sup>st</sup> Ave W, Kalispell, MT 59901

Phone: 406.751.8200

Fax: 406.751.8210

## MEMO

To: Flathead County Commissioners  
Mike Pence

From: Jeff Harris, Director 

Date: June 28, 2010

RE: Requested CETP Projects

June 1, 2010 was the deadline for submitting CETP trail proposals and letters of interest. Prior to the deadline the county ran three display advertisements requesting trail project proposals. The proposals have been summarized in a Memorandum, dated June 9, 2010, and complete proposal submittals provided to the commission for your consideration. At that time the commission directed staff to reconvene the CETP Review Team to evaluate proposals and provide a recommendation back to the commission.

The Team met on June 22, 2010 to discuss the proposals and formulate a recommendation. An evaluation and recommendation summary is attached to this memo for your review and consideration. We are keeping the original evaluation rating forms in anticipation of a future inquiry.

I will ask Elaine to schedule some of your time in the near future to discuss and possibly take action regarding the trail proposals. As always, please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions or would like copies of the evaluation rating forms.

Thank you in advance.

Cc: CETP Review Team

## **2010 CTEP Trail Proposals Evaluation Summary**

The 2010 CTEP Evaluation process included independent team member and group reviews of trail requests submitted in response to county advertisements soliciting trail proposals. Three trail requests and two letters of interest were received by the submission date. No late proposals were received. The review team included:

Jed Fisher – Parks and Recreation  
Peter Steele – County Attorney's Office  
David Prunty – Road and Bridge  
Don Spivey – PATHS/ Parks and Recreation Board  
Marcia Sheffels – School Superintendent's Office  
Alex Hogle – Planning and Zoning  
Jeff Harris – Planning and Zoning

Marcia declined to participate due to workload, leaving six reviewers who participated in the evaluation.

Proposal packets, including evaluation rating forms, were sent to reviewers in advance of a team meeting scheduled for June 22, 2010 to allow team members an opportunity to assess proposals prior to the meeting. At the meeting reviewers modified the evaluation form to include point ranges and amended one secondary criterion. The evaluation form consisted of 13 primary (0 – 10 points each) or secondary (0 – 5 points each) rating criteria, with a total 100 points possible.

### **Primary Criteria**

#### **Rating (0 – 10 points) 70 points possible**

1. Is the project part of a trails plan or transportation plan?
2. Does the project link or connect to an existing trail segment?
3. Does the project provide safe pedestrian access to a school or park?
4. Does the project service a larger population within proximity?
5. Is more than 50% of the project situated within an existing bike/trail easement?
6. Can construction related constraints be reasonably minimized?
7. Has the local community expressed support for the project?

### **Secondary Criteria**

#### **Rating (0 - 5 points) 30 points possible**

8. Is the proposal cost estimate reasonable?
9. Can the project be implemented within the road easement or R-O-W?
10. Have the sponsor committed to the local match?
11. Can environmental impacts be reasonably mitigated?
12. Has a commitment been made for adequate maintenance of the facility?
13. Can the project be constructed within a two year timeframe?

The team thoroughly discussed each request, identifying strengths and weaknesses and rated each request accordingly. Reviewers also provided general comments referring to past

experience and program observations specific to approving appropriate maintenance funds as part of the trail approval process.

It was conservatively assumed that the program had approximately \$800,000 in unencumbered funds available. This is based on staff records showing \$700,000 available (including 2010 appropriation of \$ 260,000 would bring the total available to \$960,000). Discounting \$118,000 committed to the City of Kalispell the remaining total is \$842,000.

The review results were evenly divided between Blacktail Trail and Swan River Trail. The Historic Red Bridge received a third choice from all reviewers. The table below summarizes the evaluation results:

<u>Project</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Swan River Trail	3 reviewers	3 reviewers	
Blacktail Trail	3 reviewers	3 reviewers	
Historic Red Bridge			6 reviewers

Summaries of the point spreads by reviewer are attached to this report.

**The CTEP Review Team recommends that the commission allocate CTEP funds in the following manner:**

- 1. The commission approves and funds the Blacktail Trail in Lakeside (\$400,000).**
- 2. The commission approves and funds the north segment (one mile) of the Swan River Trail in Bigfork (\$400,000).**
- 3. The review team does not recommend funding the Historic Red Bridge project.**

#### **General Review Team Comments**

- Maintenance funding is integral to trails development and needs to be recognized and approved prior to any trail approval. Every trail approval should have a maintenance budget included as a required component. Only the swan river trail directly addressed maintenance in their proposal.
- Maintenance funding may include private funding but must include a long term commitment.
- Change orders affect an overall trail project and should be included in the local sponsor match formula.

- Maintenance should be required to be addressed when the county is requesting proposals and trail requests.
- Generally, estimated project costs can be grossly understated. Approximate construction estimates aren't provided until design/engineering is complete and a commitment of funds has already occurred.
- The local sponsor match should be transferred to the county immediately prior to the county-state project agreement.



**2010 CTEP Proposals  
Rating Summary  
Blacktail Trail**

	<u>JF</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>DP</u>	<u>DS</u>	<u>AH</u>	<u>JH</u>
<b>Primary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 – 10 points)</b>						
1. part of trails/trans plan	10	10	10	9	10	8
2. connect existing trail	1	0	8	5	9	2
3. safe access to school/park	9	6	10	6	10	9
4. service larger population	8	5	8	6	7	9
5. 50% within bike easement	6	9	6	8	8	8
6. construction constraints	8	9	8	6	8	8
7. community support	10	9	8	8	7	7
<b>Subtotal (70 points possible)</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Secondary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 - 5 points)</b>						
8. estimated cost reasonable	5	5	5	3	4	5
9. within the road R-O-W	4	4	3	3	3	4
10. sponsor local match	4	5	5	3	5	3
11. environmental impacts	4	3	4	5	5	5
12. adequate maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	1
13. constructed within 2 years	5	3	3	3	5	5
<b>Subtotal (30 points possible)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Total points</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>74</b>

**2010 CTEP Proposals  
Rating Summary  
Blacktail Trail**

	<u>JF</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>DP</u>	<u>DS</u>	<u>AH</u>	<u>JH</u>
<b>Primary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 – 10 points)</b>						
1. part of trails/trans plan	10	10	10	9	10	8
2. connect existing trail	1	0	8	5	9	2
3. safe access to school/park	9	6	10	6	10	9
4. service larger population	8	5	8	6	7	9
5. 50% within bike easement	6	9	6	8	8	8
6. construction constraints	8	9	8	6	8	8
7. community support	10	9	8	8	7	7
<b>Subtotal (70 points possible)</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Secondary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 - 5 points)</b>						
8. estimated cost reasonable	5	5	5	3	4	5
9. within the road R-O-W	4	4	3	3	3	4
10. sponsor local match	4	5	5	3	5	3
11. environmental impacts	4	3	4	5	5	5
12. adequate maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	1
13. constructed within 2 years	5	3	3	3	5	5
<b>Subtotal (30 points possible)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Total points</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>74</b>



**2010 CTEP Proposals  
Rating Summary  
Historic Red Bridge Trail**

	<u>JF</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>DP</u>	<u>DS</u>	<u>AH</u>	<u>JH</u>
<b>Primary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 – 10 points)</b>						
1. part of trails/trans plan	10	10	10	5	10	5
2. connect existing trail	2	0	5	4	2	3
3. safe access to school/park	5	4	2	3	3	3
4. service larger population	8	4	5	6	6	3
5. 50% within bike easement	10	10	10	10	10	8
6. construction constraints	6	10	10	8	8	5
7. community support	6	5	5	8	5	3
<b>Subtotal (70 points possible)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Secondary Criteria</b>						
<b>Rating (0 - 5 points)</b>						
8. estimated cost reasonable	5	5	5	5	5	4
9. within the road R-O-W	5	5	5	5	5	4
10. sponsor local match	0	0	0	0	0	1
11. environmental impacts	5	5	5	4	5	4
12. adequate maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. constructed within 2 years	0	5	0	3	3	0
<b>Subtotal (30 points possible)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Total points</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>43</b>